

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the first complete examination of the instant application. Claims 1-33 are currently pending in the instant application. Claims 1, 18, 21, 22 and 29 are independent. Each of the claims currently pending in the instant application has been amended, except for claims 13 and 16. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

DRAWINGS OBJECTION

The informal drawings originally submitted in the instant application stand objected to by the Examiner. Submitted herewith is a Drawing Correction Authorization Request (DCAR) for the Examiner's consideration. The DCAR includes formal drawings for the Examiner's consideration. Applicants respectfully submit that the submission of the formal drawings obviates the Examiner's objection. Acknowledgement of receipt and approval of the submitted formal drawings are respectfully requested in response to this Amendment.

SPECIFICATION OBJECTION

The specification originally filed in the instant application stands objected to by the Examiner. In response to the specification objection, Applicants have submitted a Substitute Specification for the Examiner's consideration. It is believed that the Substitute Specification does not contain new matter.

The specification objection also includes an objection of the Abstract of the Disclosure. However, Applicants respectfully submit that the current Abstract of the Disclosure is not in

conflict with 37 C.F.R. 1.72. That is, the current Abstract of the Disclosure does not "exceed 150 words in length."

In view of the enclosed Substitute Specification and the above comments, Applicants respectfully submit that the specification objection has been obviated.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-21 and 29-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. In particular, the Examiner asserts that certain subject matter set forth in the claims is not disclosed in the specification. Furthermore, claims 1-21 and 29-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

With regard to the claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection is unsubstantiated or moot in view of the amendments to the claims. The Examiner maintains that the recitation "sub-assembly" is not discussed in the instant specification. However, referring to the included Substitute Specification, one instance where disclosure relating to a sub-assembly may be found in the specification is page 5, line 21 thereof. In addition, the Examiner asserts that the specification fails to disclose "the at least one projection is displaceable in relation to the electrical element." Disclosure relating to a projection being displaceable may be found on page 3, line 18 of the enclosed Substitute Specification. In view of the enclosed Substitute Specification, the amended claims, and the foregoing comments,

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

The Examiner refers to various originally pending claims in making the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. As is evident from the Examiner's review of this Amendment, Applicants have carefully amended all but a few of the originally pending claims. Applicants respectfully submit that the amended claims clearly conform with the requirements under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. However, it should be noted, that the amendments to the claims have not been made for reasons related to patentability. That is, the amendments are merely clarifying in nature and should not be considered as being related to overcoming a patentability concern. Moreover, the amendments to the claims are non-narrowing in nature.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(B)

Claims 1-21 and 29-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Haas et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,628,653. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Haas et al. teach a shielded modular adapter. The modular adapter is generally illustrated in Figure 1 of the relied upon patent. The adapter includes several insulated wires 106 having connected thereto pins 107. The adapter also includes a body 102 for housing the insulated wires 106. Attachable to the body 102 is a connector 101 that receives the pins 107.

Amended independent claim 1 includes the recitation "an electro-acoustic element for receiving an electrical signal and converting it to an audio signal, or for receiving an audio signal and converting it to an electrical signal...." (Emphasis added.) The adapter taught by Haas et al. is incapable of performing at least the indicated limitations of independent claim 1. That is, Haas

et al. fail to teach or suggest an adaptor capable of receiving an electrical signal and converting it to an audio signal, or for receiving an audio signal and converting it to an electrical signal. As a matter of fact, there is no mention of audio signals in the relied upon patent document. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is allowable over the patent document relied upon by the Examiner for at least the reasons stated immediately heretofore.

With regard to the additional independent claims rejected by the Examiner, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are allowable at least for essentially the same reasons discussed in conjunction with the rejection of independent claim 1. With regard to the rejected dependent claims, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are allowable at least due to their dependence upon an allowable independent claim.

In accordance to the above, Applicant's respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

In view of the amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that each of the claims rejections set forth in the current Office Action have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly reconsideration and withdrawal of the claims rejections are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, and/or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone Timothy R. Wyckoff (Reg. No. 46,175) at (703) 390-3030 in the Washington D.C. area.


Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKY & PIERCE, P.L.C

By:

 #46,175
John A. Castellano, Reg. No. 35,094

JAC/TRW:tljw

P.O. Box 8910
Reston, Virginia 20195
(703) 390-3030